

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Memorandum of Conversation

DATE: 5 September 1957

SUBJECT : Liaison Between DDI and DDP on OCB and NSC Matters

PARTICIPANTS: J. Douglas, T. Parrott, W. O. Webb

COPIES TO :

1. In separate luncheon meetings with Douglas and Parrott I think that a start was made toward some improvement in the whole matter of liaison between DDI and DDP on NSC and OCB matters.

2. Douglas. Douglas was anxious to know whether we were satisfied with the DDP comments on NSC drafts and also wanted any ideas I might have on how these comments could be improved. The gist of my remarks, with which he seemed to concur, included:

(a) I told him I thought the DDP could make its greatest contribution in the field of Communist subversive potential and the effectiveness of indigenous security forces. This was an area on which DDP might have information not available to DDI and which might have a direct influence on DDP operations. Douglas welcomed this suggestion and volunteered the rather surprising information that the division in DDP primarily responsible for these matters had in the past never been given an opportunity to review NSC drafts. He has subsequently told me that this will be corrected.

(b) I said that we could usually rely on DDI offices for strictly factual comment and that I saw no reason for burdening DDP with this responsibility. On the other hand, I told him we always welcome views of a judgment or an estimative nature from whatever source. We were not even adverse to receiving unsolicited comments with a policy flavor.

(c) I also reaffirmed with Douglas what I thought had been previous practice,

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

namely, that we would reserve the right to accept or reject comments coming from the various branches and divisions in DDP, unless Douglas let us know either orally or in writing when a given comment had the backing of Mr. Wisner. In addition, Douglas said that he would take steps to let us know when a given policy paper needed to be changed for DDP operational purposes.

3. Parrott. At a luncheon meeting with Parrott we ranged over the whole area of DDI liaison with and participation in the Agency activities on the OCB front. The principal subjects discussed were:

(a) Parrott felt quite strongly that the Agency should normally not have two members (one from DDP and one from DDI) on OCB working groups. CIA should not be the only Agency with two members on a working group. Moreover, it was important that the Agency not speak with two voices at the working group level.

(b) Re assigning DDI personnel as members of working groups on normal country or area NSC papers, we agreed that a DDI member could contribute perhaps more than the DDP member to Progress Reports, but that the Outline Plans of Operation fell more in the province of DDP. Not wishing to have two CIA members on working groups and believing that continuity was essential, we agreed that the representative on normal working groups should continue for the present to be a DDP man.

(c) However, there might be a number of ad hoc working groups where the above objections to DDI membership did not apply. An example is the current project on India's economic problems. Parrott said he would consult with me prior to appointing representatives to such working groups to determine jointly whether they should be DDI or DDP.

(d) Parrott also said he would familiarize himself further with the mechanics of how working group papers -- particularly Progress Reports -- got started. We both felt sure that DDI could make a more effective contribution at a very early stage of the drafting. It might be possible for the DDP representative to levy a request on the DDI for contributions -- as was done in the Satellite contingency papers. We agreed to explore this further.

(e) Meanwhile, I would explore ways and means of improving the DDI comments. In most cases, Parrott now receives separate comments from ONE and OCI. The principal improvements needed are (i) to iron out any differences that may exist in these comments prior to sending them to Parrott, (ii) to indicate the relative importance of the various comments (some are pretty piddling); and (iii) to indicate which comments, if any, have the backing of the DDI himself.

(f) I concurred in Parrott's request that no DDI comments on OCB papers be passed to Mrozinski.

(g) In summary, we were in agreement that the DDI role in OCB papers could be strengthened, but that the approach should be a gradual, ad hoc one rather than attempting any major, formalized change in the present procedures.

W. O. WEBB

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~